

tinue in effect beyond January 7, 1994. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency with respect to Libya. This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
December 2, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register,
12:22 p.m., December 3, 1993]

NOTE: This notice was published in the *Federal Register* on December 6.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders on
Continuation of Libyan Emergency**
December 2, 1993

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Libyan emergency is to continue in effect beyond January 7, 1994, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

The crisis between the United States and Libya that led to the declaration on January 7, 1986, of a national emergency has not been resolved, and Libya continues to use and support international terrorism. Such Libyan actions and policies pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and vital foreign policy interests of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to apply economic pressure to the Government of Libya to reduce its ability to support international terrorism.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

**Statement on Signing the
International Parental Kidnapping
Crime Act of 1993**

December 2, 1993

Today I have signed into law H.R. 3378, the "International Parental Kidnapping Crime Act of 1993." This legislation underscores the seriousness with which the United States regards international child abduction. It makes this crime, for the first time, a Federal felony offense.

H.R. 3378 recognizes that the international community has created a mechanism to promote the resolution of international parental kidnapping by civil means. This mechanism is the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction. H.R. 3378 reflects the Congress' awareness that the Hague Convention has resulted in the return of many children and the Congress' desire to ensure that the creation of a Federal child abduction felony offense does not and should not interfere with the Convention's continued successful operation.

This Act expresses the sense of the Congress that proceedings under the Hague Convention, where available, should be the "option of first choice" for the left-behind parent. H.R. 3378 should be read and used in a manner consistent with the Congress' strong expressed preference for resolving these difficult cases, if at all possible, through civil remedies.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
December 2, 1993.

NOTE: H.R. 3378, approved December 2, was assigned Public Law No. 103-173. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 3.

Remarks to the Democratic Leadership Council*December 3, 1993*

Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Senator Breaux, and ladies and gentlemen, thank you for that warm welcome. It's wonderful to be back here. I want to thank John Breaux for his leadership of the DLC, his constancy, and his friendship and support to me in this last challenging year. I want to congratulate Dave McCurdy, who has been one of our most faithful members for a long time, on his upcoming leadership of the DLC.

I want to say how wonderful it is for me to see so many of you, my friends from all across America here, particularly some of my friends from New Hampshire I see in the audience. Hillary spent yesterday in New Hampshire and came home gloating that she had been there and I hadn't. Thank you very much.

What's Bruno doing over here? Are you segregating him?

I have given a lot of thought to what I ought to say here today. It was 8 or 9 years ago now that—well, almost 9 years ago—after the Democrats had lost yet another Presidential election, that a group of Democrats gathered to try to sharply define what we stood for and where we wanted our party to go. It was clear that we needed an infusion of new ideas and new energy, a new direction and reinvigoration into the party that most of us belong to by heritage, instinct, and conviction.

My wife used to tell me—I repeated often on the campaign trail—that insanity was doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result. But we decided we would try some new things and see if we could produce some different results, because we knew that our country needed a new direction. After all, in the previous 12 years we had seen the quadrupling of the deficit, the stagnation of wages, profound economic and social problems in this country going unaddressed, and middle class Americans continuing to stay with our opponents in the other party largely because they felt we could not be trusted to promote their economic interests or their values and our poli-

cies here at home, to promote our national interests abroad or to give them a Government that gave them honest value for the hard-earned dollars they put into it in taxes.

In the Democratic Leadership Council we always understood that for our politics and our policies to move this Nation, we had to express the basic values of mainstream America and promote those economic interests. The heart and soul of the American experiment has always been a personally secure and growing middle class, challenged to achieve new opportunities, challenged to be part of a larger community, challenged ever more to assume the new responsibilities of each new age.

The American dream that we were all raised on is a simple but powerful one: If you work hard and play by the rules, you should be given a chance to go as far as your God-given ability will take you. Throughout our history our party has been the fulcrum that allowed working people to lift themselves up into the middle class. And we know that if we're to be true to our historic mission we must be the party of the values and the interests of the middle class and, more importantly, the values and the interests of those who want to become part of the growing middle class and the American dream. We must fight their fight. We must give voice to their concerns. We must give them the chance to build security while embracing change. And above all, we must honor those basic values of opportunity, responsibility, and community, of work and family and faith. This is what it means, in my view, to be a new Democrat. I was proud to campaign as one, I'm proud to govern as one.

Because we are Democrats we believe in our party's historic values of opportunity, social justice, and an unshakable commitment to the interests of working men and women and their children. Because we are new Democrats we promote those old values in new ways. We believe in expanding opportunity, not Government. We believe in empowerment, not entitlement. We believe in leading the world, not retreating from it. We believe that the line between domestic and foreign policy is becoming increasingly blurred as the interests and the future of every American and every city and hamlet